



**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**  
Corres. and Mail  
**BOX AF**

AF 12871

**PATENT APPLICATION**

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR §1.116**  
**EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER ART UNIT 2871**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Osamu OKUMURA et al.

Group Art Unit: 2871

Application No.: 09/671,354

Examiner: T. Ton

Filed: September 27, 2000

Docket No.: 038959.01

For: REFLECTIVE COLOR LCD WITH COLOR FILTERS HAVING A PARTICULAR  
TRANSMISSIVITY

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the September 24, 2003 Office Action, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 30, 31, 33-41 and 44-67 are pending. Claims 34-36, 39-41 and 44-48 have previously been withdrawn from consideration. At this point in the prosecution, Applicants request withdrawn claims 34-36, 39-41 and 44-48 be rejoined and considered.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Office Action's indication that claims 37, 38, 56, 60, 61 and 64-66 are allowed, and that claims 52, 57 and 58 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 57 and 58, which depend from allowed claim 56, should also have been indicated as allowed. Appropriate correction is requested.

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800  
DEC 23 2003

RECEIVED

The Office Action rejects claims 30, 31, 33, 49, 50, 53-55, 59, 62, 63 and 67 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,365,357 to Ohgawara et al. (hereinafter "Ohgawara"); and claim 51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohgawara in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,964,702 to Sugimoto et al. (hereinafter "Sugimoto"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 30, the Office Action asserts that Ohgawara, at col. 8, lines 42-50, and in Fig. 3, discloses the invention set forth in claim 30. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that Ohgawara discloses a color LCD having color filters formed in both the display and peripheral regions of the display device. The Office Action asserts that, in the display region, color filters are disposed in pixel portions of the device. The Office Action further asserts that "[t]he regions with no color filters are considered as 'second section'."

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's interpretation of Ohgawara and its application to the invention set forth in independent claim 30.

Ohgawara does not teach or suggest a liquid crystal display comprising, *inter alia*, a dot area including a first section and a second section, a color filter arranged in the first section, wherein no color filters are arranged in the second section, as set forth in claim 30.

Ohgawara, in Figs. 1 and 3, discloses a feature in which a shielding film 6, 26 and a color filter 7, 27 are arranged in a surrounding portion or peripheral region 5, 25 outside a display portion or region 1, 21. Ohgawara shows that an end portion of the respective color filters (symbols 3, 7, 17 and 23) is overlapped with the respective shielding films (symbols 4, 6, 16 and 26), and the part between each color filter is surrounded by a shielding film. In Ohgawara, as shown in Fig. 4 and disclosed at col. 6, lines 13-25, a dot area, i.e., the area of the electrode (10) which becomes a pixel (2, 22) includes only one section. Further, in Ohgawara, each color filter in the pixel area (i.e., dot area) is formed so as to be larger than the area of the pixel area (i.e., dot area).

This is different than the recited feature of a dot area having a first section and a

second section, a color filter arranged in the first section, wherein no color filters are arranged in the second section, as set forth in claim 30.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 30 is patentable over Ohgawara.

Sugimoto does not provide the deficiencies in Ohgawara discussed above with respect to independent claim 30. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 31, 33, 49-51, 53-55, 59 and 63, which depend from independent claim 30, are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 30. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Regarding independent claim 62, Ohgawara does not teach or suggest a liquid crystal display comprising, *inter alia*, a plurality of dot areas, each of the dot areas including a first section and a second section, a reflector arranged outside of the first electrode and the second electrode, and a color filter arranged in the first section, the first section comprising about 15% or more and about 45% or less of the dot area, as set forth in claim 62.

As discussed above, in Ohgawara, as shown in Fig. 4 and disclosed at col. 6, lines 13-25, a dot area, i.e., the area of the electrode (10) which becomes a pixel (2, 22) includes only one section. Thus, Ohgawara fails to teach or suggest dot areas including a first section and a second section set forth in claim 62.

The Office Action, at page 3, asserts that "[t]he size of the color filters is commonly smaller than the dot area in the art." However, the Office Action provides no evidence to support this conclusion. Contrary to the Office Action's assertion, Ohgawara, at col. 6, lines 13-25, and in Fig. 4, discloses that color filters 3 cover more than 100% of the pixel portion 2 (i.e., dot area) defined by electrodes 10. Thus, Ohgawara not only fails to disclose a dot area with a first section and a second section, Ohgawara also teaches away from the first section

# BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 09/671,354

[containing a color filter] comprising about 15% or more and about 45% or less of the dot area, as set forth in claim 62.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 62 is patentable over Ohgawara. Claim 67, which depends from independent claim 62, is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 62. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

At this point in the prosecution, Applicants request withdrawn claims 34-36, 39-41 and 44-48 be rejoined and considered. Applicants respectfully submit that withdrawn claims 34-36, 39-41 and 44-48 are also patentable over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed above.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 30, 31, 33-36, 39-41, 44-51, 53-55, 59, 62, 63 and 67 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

George P. Simion  
Registration No. 47,089

JAO:GPS/ccs

Date: December 15, 2003

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--